

## UNITED STATE EPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

dress:	COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
	Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		
08/462,703	3 06/05/9	95 HODGEN		Ę	SCH1309-C1
HM22/0522			$\neg$	EX	(AMINER
MILLEN WHITE ZELANO AND BRANIGAN				WEBMAN, E	
ARLINGTON COURTHOUSE PLAZA I				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1400	)				•
2200 CLARENDON BOULEVARD				1617	•
ARLINGTON	VA 22201			DATE MAILED:	
					05/22/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	plicant(s)		
Office Action Summary	08/46270)	Ho	D66N		
Omec Action Cammary	08/46270) Examiner 4/69 N	AN	Group Art Unit		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears				dress-	
Period for Response					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	T TO EXPIRE	3 MONT	H(S) FROM THE		
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a</li> <li>If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by defau</li> <li>Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by</li> </ul>	response within the statu lt, expire SIX (6) MONTH	tory minimum of t S from the mailing	hirty (30) days will be co	onsidered timely ation .	
Status	,				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	8/01				
☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .	/				
<ul> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance except for accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935</li> </ul>			the merits is close	ed in	
Disposition of Claims	•				
Claim(s) 42-107		is/are	pending in the appli	cation.	
√2 − 1 6 7  Of the above claim(s)		is/are	is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
□ Claim(s)					
©Claim(s) 92 -107					
□ Claim(s)					
□ Claim(s)		are su	bject to restriction o	r election	
Application Papers		require	ement.		
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing F	Review, PTO-948.				
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is 🗆 approved	☐ disapprove	d.		
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected	d to by the Examiner.				
$\ \square$ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
$\hfill \square$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)					
<ul> <li>□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority unde</li> <li>□ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the</li> <li>□ received.</li> <li>□ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)</li> </ul>	e priority documents h	ave been			
☐ received in this national stage application from the Intern					
*Certified copies not received:	-		·		
Attachment(s)					
XInformation Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(€	s). 38,40 [	Interview Sumr	mary, PTO-413		
☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892			nal Patent Application	on, PTO-152	
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948					
Office	ction Summary				

Application/Control Number: 08/462,703

Art Unit: 1617

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Page 2

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 42-55, 102-107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hodgen (AW) in view of Black (A).

The claims appears to be drawn to compositions and methods of contraception achieved by administering estrogen and/or progestin and an antiprogestin. Hodgen discloses that estrogen-progestin combinations are currently available (see page 66, middle column, last paragraph).

Hodgen also discloses that the antiprogestin RU 486 may be useful as an ovulation inhibiting contraceptive (see page 66, first column - middle column). The claims differ from the cited reference in claiming the combination of estrogen-progestin regimens with an antiprogestin as well as progestin only regimens with an antiprogestin. To combine an estrogen-progestin regimen with an antiprogestin would have been obvious as both are known as contraceptives and the combination would also be expected to have a contraceptive effect. To combine a progestin only regimen with an antiprogestin would have been obvious in view of Black which teaches a progestin only contraceptive (see abstract) and because as stated above it is obvious to combine two contraceptives to be used together for a contraceptive purpose. The claims fail to patentably distinguish over the state of the art as represented by the cited references.

e.

Art Unit: 1617

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 42-46, 56-81, 94, 98-99 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 5,468,736. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the dosages administered overlap.

Claims 42-107 are of this application conflict with claims 42-107 of Application No. 08/462,705. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

Application/Control Number: 08/462,703

Art Unit: 1617

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward J. Webman whose telephone number is (703) -308-4432. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, M. Moezie, can be reached on (703) -308-0570. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) -305-3592.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) -308-1235.

Webman/LR

April 24, 2001

Page 4